



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/759,154	01/16/2001	Hirochika Ueyama	P66321US0	2837

7590 03/28/2002

JACOBSON, PRICE, HOLMAN & STERN,
PROFESSIONAL LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY
THE JENIFER BUILDING
400 SEVENTH STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

EXAMINER

LE, DANG D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2834

DATE MAILED: 03/28/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/759,154

Applicant(s)

UEYAMA ET AL.

Examiner

Dang D Le

Art Unit

2834

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 January 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it contains the word "comprises" in line 1. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In general, the claims are narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors.

Claim 1 is indefinite because it is not clear what the phrase beginning at line 22 "the position of the rotary body . . ." to the end of the claim means. It is neither clear what is "determined by the mechanical restraining means and an integral output of the integral operation unit" as shown in lines 4 and 5, page 47.

In addition, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the following limitations in the claims. Claim 1 recites the limitations "the median of an integral output" in line 24, page 46, "the vicinity of one of limit positions" in line 3, page 47 and "the vicinity of the other limit position" in line 7, page 47. It is not clear if "an integral output" in line 5, page 47 is different from "an integral output in line 24, page 46. Claim 2 recites the limitations

"the output" in line 13, page 47, "the corresponding integral output" in line 19, page 47, "the median" in lines 1 and 4, page 48.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Audo et al. in view of Kawashima.

Regarding claim 1, Audo et al. show a magnetic bearing device (Figure 1) for magnetically levitating a rotary body (3) by contactlessly supporting the body with magnetic attraction of pairs of electromagnets (5, 6) with respect to an axial direction and two radial directions (Figure 2, 5a-5d) orthogonal to each other and to the axial direction, the rotary body having movable ranges (gap around shaft 3) in the three

Art Unit: 2834

supporting directions determined by mechanical restraining means (18, 19), the magnetic bearing device being characterized in that the device comprises a pair of electromagnets (5, 6) so arranged as to hold the rotary body at opposite sides thereof in the direction of each of control axes in the respective three supporting directions (Figures 1 and 2), means (14, 15, 16) for detecting the position of the rotary body in the direction of the control axis and electromagnet control means (20, Figure 2) having at least an integral operation unit for controlling the electromagnets based on the result of detection of the position by the position detecting means, the electromagnet control means (20) comprising a target levitated position setting means (45, Figure 6) for setting as a target levitated position (reference position, Figure 4) of the rotary body in the direction of the control axis.

Audo et al. do not show the position of the rotary body corresponding to the median of an integral output which is the output of the integral operation unit when the rotary body is magnetically levitated in the vicinity of one of limit positions in the direction of the control axis determined by the mechanical restraining means and an integral output of the integral operation unit when the rotary body is magnetically levitated in the vicinity of the other limit position.

Kawashima shows the position of the rotary body corresponding to the median ($C = (A+B)/2$) of an integral output which is the output of the integral operation unit when the rotary body is magnetically levitated in the vicinity of one of limit positions in the direction of the control axis determined by the mechanical restraining means and an integral output of the integral operation unit when the rotary body is magnetically

Art Unit: 2834

levitated in the vicinity of the other limit position (Figure 2) for the purpose of centering the position of the rotor.

Since Audo et al. and Kawashima are all from the same field of endeavor; the purpose disclosed by one inventor would have been recognized in the pertinent art of the others.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to make the position of the rotary body corresponding to the median of an integral output which is the output of the integral operation unit when the rotary body is magnetically levitated in the vicinity of one of limit positions in the direction of the control axis determined by the mechanical restraining means and an integral output of the integral operation unit when the rotary body is magnetically levitated in the vicinity of the other limit position as taught by Kawashima for the purpose discussed above.

Regarding claim 2, it is noted that Kawashima also shows the target position setting means being adapted to position the rotary body at said one limit position (steps 100, 102), thereafter magnetically levitate the rotary body in the vicinity thereof, obtain the integral output at this time (step 104) to store the output as a first limit position integral output in a memory, gradually shift the magnetically levitated position of the rotary body toward said other limit position (step 106), determine the position of the rotary body every time the rotary body is so shifted by a small distance (step 108) at a time and the corresponding integral output for storage as an intermediate position and an intermediate position integral output in the memory, move the rotary body to said

other limit position (step 106), thereafter magnetically levitate the rotary body in the vicinity thereof, obtain the integral output at this time for use as a second limit position integral output, determine the median (step 112) of the first limit position integral output and the second limit position integral output, and select the output most proximate to the median from among the intermediate position integral outputs stored in the memory to determine the intermediate position corresponding to the selected intermediate position integral output as the target levitated position (Figure 2).

Information on How to Contact USPTO

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dang D Le whose telephone number is (703) 305-0156. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nestor Ramirez can be reached on (703) 308-1371. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7382 for regular communications and (703) 308-7382 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1782.

DDL
March 22, 2002

